

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/759,825	TYSON, JAMES M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ernesto Garcia	3679	

All Participants:

(1) Ernesto Garcia.

(2) Mr. Charles M. Kaplan.

Status of Application: Non-Final

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 24 August 2005

Time: 3:22PM

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

8 and 17-20

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called Mr. Kaplan to cancel claims 17-20 as these claims were directed to the non-elected invention. The examiner also indicated that there is no basis on the remarks to indicate that the examiner has made a clear error in making the restriction and therefore claims 17-20 should be cancelled to issue an allowance. Mr. Kaplan agreed to cancel claims 17-20. In the same interview, the examiner discussed an examiner's amendment to claim 8. The examiner indicated that the limitation "said hole being sufficiently large to permit flying insects such as bees, wasps and the like to enter and nest in said post" in claim 8, line 4 be deleted for clarifying the claim. Mr. Kaplan agreed and also suggested that the comma in the first line of claim 8 be deleted. Other changes to the claim were discussed as noted in the Examiner's Amendment.